

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TEXARKANA DIVISION**

MATTHEW RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN SALMONSON,

Respondent.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:23-CV-39-RWS-JBB

ORDER

Before the Court is Petitioner Matthew Ramirez's petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging the computation of his sentence. Docket No. 1. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge J. Boone Baxter in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636.

On January 28, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending Respondent's motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 9) be granted and that the above application for the writ of habeas corpus be dismissed with prejudice. Docket No. 11. A copy of the Report and Recommendation was sent to Petitioner at his last known address, return receipt requested, but no objections have been received. The Fifth Circuit has explained that where a letter is properly placed in the United States mail, a presumption exists that the letter reached its destination in the usual time and was actually received by the person to whom it was addressed. *Faciane v. Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada*, 931 F.3d 412, 420–21 and n.9 (5th Cir. 2019).

Because no objections have been received, Petitioner is barred from *de novo* review by the District Judge of the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Moreover, except upon grounds of plain error, an aggrieved party is barred from appellate review

of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the District Court. *See Duarte v. City of Lewisville, Texas*, 858 F.3d 348, 352 (5th Cir. 2017); *Arriaga v. Laxminarayan*, Case No. 4:21-CV-00203-RAS, 2021 WL 3287683, at *1 (E.D. Tex. July 31, 2021).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings in the above-captioned case and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Upon such review, the Court has determined that the Report of the Magistrate Judge is correct. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (where no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law"). Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the Report of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 11) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED the Respondent's motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 9) is **GRANTED**. It is further

ORDERED the above-captioned petition for writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 26th day of March, 2025.


ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE